



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/715,951

11/17/2003

C. Troy Jensen

200308942-1

4461

7590 04/29/2008
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

TAN, ALVIN H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2173

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/715,951

Applicant(s)

JENSEN ET AL.

Examiner

ALVIN H. TAN

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 1/30/08, with respect to Anderson et al (Pub. No. US 2004/0015566) under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Upon further consideration, claims 1-28, and 32-47 have been examined and rejected. This Office action is responsive to the amendment filed on 1/30/08, which has been entered in the above identified application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The corrections to claims 5 and 10 have been approved, and the rejections to claims 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 9-25, 28, 32-40, and 42-47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuda et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,120,910 B2).

Claims 1-3, 9-25, 47

4-1. Regarding claim 1, Matsuda teaches the claim comprising organizing job information into menus and submenus and displaying said job information organized into said menus and submenus to a user, by disclosing *[figures 10, 25]* which shows menus and submenus for displaying job information *[column 18, lines 12-24]*.

4-2. Regarding claim 2, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 1, wherein said menus and said submenus comprise a main menu including main menu categories, by disclosing *[figures 10, 25]*.

Matsuda teaches a submenu under each of said main menu categories, by disclosing submenus for selecting a type of job to be displayed *[figures 10, 25]*.

4-3. Regarding claim 3, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 2, further comprising navigating through said menus and displaying said submenus on a user interface when said menus are selected, by disclosing displaying submenus when a menu is selected *[column 10, line 66 to column 11, line 20]*.

4-4. Regarding claims 9-11, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 1, further comprising displaying said job information on a web page, providing said web page with an embedded web server associated with a document processing device, and viewing said web page with a web browser, by disclosing providing a Web server

Art Unit: 2173

function to the apparatus and using general-purpose Web client software [*column 1, lines 52-56; column 10, lines 12-20; figure 10*].

4-5. Regarding claim 12, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 1, further comprising displaying said job information on a user interface, by disclosing [*figure 10*].

4-6. Regarding claim 13, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 12, wherein said user interface organizes said job information into said menus and submenus, by disclosing [*figure 10*].

4-7. Regarding claims 14, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 13, wherein said user interface is configured to display job information regarding jobs that have already been processed, by disclosing a log displaying completed jobs [*column 19, lines 4-19; figure 11*].

4-8. Regarding claims 15 and 16, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 13, wherein said user interface is configured to display job information regarding jobs that are currently being processed and are in a queue waiting to be processed, by disclosing displaying the status of jobs [*column 18, lines 25-28*].

4-9. Regarding claims 17-19, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 16, further comprising processing said jobs in said queue according to a precedence and

Art Unit: 2173

processing said jobs in said queue according to a set of priority regulations wherein said priority regulations are specified by a user, by disclosing a queue for processing jobs.

Users may pause, lock, or move jobs within the queue to affect its priority [*column 18, lines 35-48*].

4-10. Regarding claim 20, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 13, wherein said user interface is configured to display a plurality of submenus for each of said main menu categories, by disclosing submenus [*figures 10, 25*].

4-11. Regarding claims 21 and 22, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 20, wherein one of said plurality of submenus comprises job information on jobs currently being processed and waiting to be processed, by disclosing displaying the status of jobs [*column 18, lines 25-28*].

4-12. Regarding claims 23, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 20, wherein one of said plurality of submenus comprises job information on jobs already processed, by disclosing a log displaying completed jobs [*column 19, lines 4-19; figure 11*].

4-13. Regarding claims 24 and 25, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 1, further comprising storing said job information and jobs processed in a memory, by disclosing storing job information in a HDD [*column 11, lines 50-57*].

4-14. Regarding claim 47, Matsuda teaches the claim wherein said job information is print job information, by disclosing print job status *[figures 10, 25]*.

Matsuda teaches organizing said print job information into menus and submenus and displaying said print job information organized into said menus and submenus to a user, by disclosing *[figures 10, 25]* which shows menus and submenus for displaying job information *[column 18, lines 12-24]*.

Claims 28, 32-37

4-15. Regarding claim 28, Matsuda teaches the claim comprising a printer for producing hardcopy documents, by disclosing printer 2095 *[column 2, lines 54-60; figure 1]*.

Matsuda teaches a document processing device memory, by disclosing a HDD *[column 6, lines 1-3; figure 3]*.

Matsuda teaches a user interface disposed on a document processing device, by disclosing the user interface as shown in *[figures 10, 25]*.

Matsuda teaches wherein said user interface is configured to select and view job information for said document processing device that is organized into and displayed in menus and submenus, by disclosing *[figures 10, 25]* which shows menus and submenus for displaying job information *[column 18, lines 12-24]*.

4-16. Regarding claims 32 and 33, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 28, wherein said user interface comprises a navigation device wherein said navigation device comprises one of directional buttons, numbered buttons, a keyboard, a keypad, a mouse, or a touch screen, by disclosing use of a mouse *[column 10, lines 22-25]*.

4-17. Regarding claim 34, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 28, wherein said device is communicatively coupled to a user terminal, by disclosing personal computer 10 *[column 3, lines 9-23; figure 1]*.

4-18. Regarding claim 35, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 34, wherein said document processing device further comprises an embedded web server, by disclosing providing a Web server function to the apparatus and using general-purpose Web client software *[column 1, lines 52-56; column 10, lines 12-20; figure 10]*.

4-19. Regarding claim 36, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 35, wherein said user terminal further comprises a web browser, by disclosing web client in personal computer 10 *[figure 1]*.

4-20. Regarding claim 37, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 34, wherein said device is communicatively coupled to said user terminal through a network, by disclosing a LAN connecting the devices *[figure 1]*.

Claims 38-40, 42, 43

4-21. Regarding claim 38, Matsuda teaches the claim comprising receiving means for receiving job requests and display means for displaying job request information in menus and submenus, by disclosing *[figures 10, 25]* which show menus and submenus for displaying job information *[column 18, lines 12-24]*.

4-22. Regarding claim 39, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 38, wherein said display means comprises a user interface, by disclosing *[figures 10, 25]*.

4-23. Regarding claim 40, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 38, wherein said display means comprises a web page, by disclosing providing a Web server function to the apparatus and using general-purpose Web client software *[column 1, lines 52-56; column 10, lines 12-20; figure 10]*.

4-24. Regarding claims 42 and 43, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 38, further comprising recording means for recording said job information wherein said recording means comprises a memory of said documents processing device, by disclosing storing job information in a HDD *[column 11, lines 50-57]*.

Claims 44-46

4-25. Regarding claim 44, Matsuda teaches the claim of storing job information in a document processing device memory, by disclosing storing job information in a HDD [column 11, lines 50-57].

Matsuda teaches organizing said job information into menus and submenus, by disclosing [figures 10, 25] which show menus and submenus for displaying job information [column 18, lines 12-24].

Matsuda teaches displaying said menus and submenus on a user interface or web page, by disclosing providing a Web server function to the apparatus and using general-purpose Web client software [column 1, lines 52-56; column 10, lines 12-20; figure 10].

4-26. Regarding claim 45, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 44, wherein said processor readable medium is associated with a document processing device, by disclosing that the HDD is part of an image processing device [figure 3].

4-27. Regarding claim 46, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 44, wherein said processor readable medium is associated with a remote server, by disclosing providing a Web server function to the apparatus and using general-purpose Web client software [column 1, lines 52-56; column 10, lines 12-20; figure 10].

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,120,910 B2) and Parry et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,239,409 B2), herein after, Parry '409.

Claims 4, 5

6-1. Regarding claim 4, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 1. Although Matsuda teaches recording and displaying the date and time of a job as shown in [figures 10, 25], Matsuda does not expressly teach wherein said organizing said job information comprises organizing said job information according to processing data and time. Parry '409 teaches organizing printing jobs based on date and time [column 9, lines 48-67; figure 4]. This provides useful way of organizing job information. Since Matsuda teaches displaying job information to a user, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to organize the job information according to date and time, as taught by Parry '409. This would provide a useful way of organizing job information.

6-2. Regarding claim 5, Matsuda and Parry '409 teach the claim with respect to claim 4, wherein jobs processed in a specified time frame are displayed on a user interface of a document processing device, by disclosing only displaying the most recent jobs [*Parry '409, column 9, lines 48-67*].

7. Claims 6-8 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,120,910 B2) and Parry (Pub. No. US 2003/0088793 A1), herein after, Parry '793.

Claims 6-8

7-1. Regarding claim 6, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 1. Matsuda does not expressly teach the claim further comprising customizing said menus and said submenus according to a user specification. Parry '793 teaches customizing imaging device menus [*paragraph 1*]. This allows for specialized menus to be designed for multiple classes of users, administrators, and specific uses in the imaging device system [*paragraph 18*]. Since Matsuda teaches providing a user interface for managing an image processing apparatus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow customizing the menus and submenus, as taught by Parry '793. This would allow for specialized menus to be designed for multiple classes of users, administrators, and specific uses in the imaging device system.

7-2. Regarding claim 7, Matsuda and Parry '793 teach the claim with respect to claim 6, wherein said customizing said menus and said submenus comprises establishing menu and submenu category names and content, by disclosing customization of menus with situation specific sub-menus of an imaging device [*Parry '793, paragraph 22; figure 2*].

7-3. Regarding claim 8, Matsuda and Parry '793 teach the claim with respect to claim 7, wherein said menu and submenu content comprises job information identifying completed jobs, pending jobs, jobs currently being processed, a source of said job, a destination of said job, a type of file or a document, when said job was processed, the type of job processed by said document processing device, a number of pages in said job, or a size of said job, by disclosing displaying job status, owner, device, type, time, and size [*Matsuda, column 18, lines 12-48*].

Claim 41

7-4. Regarding claim 41, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 38. Matsuda does not expressly teach the claim further comprising customizing means for customizing said menus and said submenus. Parry '793 teaches customizing imaging device menus [*paragraph 1*]. This allows for specialized menus to be designed for multiple classes of users, administrators, and specific uses in the imaging device system [*paragraph 18*]. Since Matsuda teaches providing a user interface for managing an image processing apparatus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2173

the art at the time the invention was made to allow customizing the menus and submenus, as taught by Parry '793. This would allow for specialized menus to be designed for multiple classes of users, administrators, and specific uses in the imaging device system.

8. Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,120,910 B2) and Bardolatzy et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,050,735 B2).

Claims 26, 27

8-1. Regarding claims 26 and 27, Matsuda teaches the claim with respect to claim 1. Matsuda does not expressly teach the claim further comprising requiring an authentication to access a restricted menu or submenu wherein said authentication comprises a login password. Bardolatzy teaches a user interface for a printing system that sets rules for displaying on an operation display unit [column 2, lines 23-42]. An authentication of a user is implemented with the aid of an authentication code such as a password [column 4, lines 1-11]. This allows for custom menus for each specific user. Since Matsuda teaches providing a user interface for managing print jobs to many users over a network, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include requiring an authentication to access a restricted menu or submenu, as taught by Bardolatzy. This would allow the interface to assign various access rights to different users.

Response to Arguments

9. The Examiner acknowledges the Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 5, 28, and 34-36, the cancellation of claims 29-31, and the addition of claim 47. Applicant's arguments, see [page 10] of Applicant's Remarks, filed 1/30/08, with respect to the rejection(s) of claims 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Matsuda et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,120,910 B2). See section 4-1.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-47 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record on attached form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R § 111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach similar systems for managing document processing device job information.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALVIN H. TAN whose telephone number is (571)272-8595. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 10:00-6:30.

Art Unit: 2173

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on 571-272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AHT

Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2173

/Tadesse Hailu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173